

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

SPEECH OF HON. EUGENE HALE,

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1876.

The House having under consideration the motion to reconsider the vote by which the President's message was referred to the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. HALE said :

Mr. SPEAKER : I propose, as certain shortcomings of this House have been referred to in the message of the President, to review some of the incidents and events of this session of the House of Representatives. I am all the more inclined to this duty, sir, because upon Tuesday last the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] declared that there is a wide and general dissatisfaction with the republican party throughout the country, and that the people demanded a change. While listening to that declaration, I thought of the counter blast of Carl Schurz, who says lately that whatever may be the errors of the republican party, it is very clear that democracy affords no relief. Luckily the present House of Representatives gives us the chance to judge of democracy, not by its promises, but by its performances.

That party carried the country in the half revolution which swept over the country in 1874. To all appearance it had the popular voice behind it. It secured almost two-thirds of the members upon this floor, thus giving to it almost irresistible power to drive through any needed and justly desired reform, should it take upon its shoulders any such measure. It had to all appearance, I say, the popular voice to sustain it. Democracy was here in such strength that whatever wise measures it should propose for actual relief to any suffering interest, there never has been a time when it could not against all objections in other quarters drive both the Senate and the Executive into consonant action. For, Mr. Speaker, it has never been, and I venture to predict will never be the case, that the popular branch of the American Congress, when it is committed to any just measure of reform, any wide-reaching policy that meets with approval from the people, can be stayed either by the Senate or by the Executive. In that regard, whenever that question and that time shall be reached, American History will duplicate English history, and it will be found, as it should be found, that with the House arrayed for the right, and the Senate or the Executive arrayed for the wrong, the Senate or the Executive must and will yield.

The dominant party in the House of Representatives had such an opportunity afforded it when it assembled on the first Monday of December last as no party has ever had. The whole country was intent upon the action of that party for the coming session. It had been sent here upon certain promises of reform in directions that affected the living interests of the people—the question of civil service reform, the question of relief from

taxation, the question of finance and the currency, and other broad general questions—upon none of which that party failed to promise largely in the canvass, that resulted in its success. In December last its promises matured, and it was confronted with pay-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no time to speak at length of the spectacle that Washington City presented to the country at the date of the assembling of this Congress. There were to be distributed by the dominant party in the House in all perhaps three hundred offices, reckoning from the page upon the floor and the folder below up to the Speakership and Clerkship of the House. And every gentleman here remembers that the city was crowded in its streets, that the hotels and the corridors of the House were thronged, and that for every place a hundred hungry applicants presented themselves here, clamoring and scrambling for the good places, and, failing in them, for the small places. The House was organized, and the work of the headsman began at once. Now, I appeal to any member upon this floor who was here in the last Congress to look over the places attached to this House, and which fell under the control of democracy under the promise of a civil service reform, and see how many familiar faces he discovers, faces that were here in the last Congress. Two or three only arrest my attention. One gentleman in the Clerk's office is allowed to remain there because of his familiarity with certain financial details and the difficulty of filling his place. The paying-teller in the Sergeant-at-Arms's office is left, and here and there is spared, as a monument of the past, an old soldier attending our doors. All of the rest have been ruthlessly submitted to the ax of the headsman, have been turned out, and others put in their places.

Mr. SPRINGER. There are more Union soldiers in the employ of this House than were in the employ of the last House.

Mr. HALE. I have heard that statement before. I do not accept it as true; my figures are different now.

Mr. RUSK. Soldiers of which army?

Mr. SPRINGER. Soldiers who were in the Union service.

Mr. HALE. This was a specimen of civil-service reform with a vengeance. But it had one advantage, and my friends on the other side were entitled to that advantage. It embarrassed the party in control. It left the House in the hands of its friends. And looking on and remembering how his party promised reform in political methods and moderation whenever it should be placed in power, it may be that Governor Tilden interpreted the action of his party as the fulfillment of its promises, and therefore in his letter of acceptance encourages the faithful followers of civil-service reform in these ingenious words :

The public interest in an honest, skillful performance of official trust must not be sacrificed to the usufruct of the incumbents.

I fancy that we are likely to hear something of the "usufruct of the incumbents" as a political evil should the presidential election go democratic.

But I must follow the course of the House. The Speaker was elected and appointed his committees, and just here was a most serious outcropping of what might be expected in the future if the elections of 1874 be repeated in 1876. It had been predicted, it had been feared, that a democratic triumph meant the restoration to power of that element in the democratic party which carried the country into civil war, and maintained that war for four cruel, tragic, desolating years. There was throughout the country a growing suspicion that this was a threatening danger. The democratic leaders knew this feeling of apprehension in the country; they have always denied it, and there have been here and elsewhere many protestations of modesty from gentlemen representing that element in the democratic party, that with them there was no existing intent of gaining the control of the Government through the control of the democratic party.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] in his speech declared—I do not use his exact words—that if any man believed that there was any danger of the South getting control of the democratic party or the country, it was a hallucination which observation and a little experience would surely dispel. I do not quote his language, but the spirit of his statement.

Now, the Speaker of this House sat in that chair, the representative of the whole party that had made him speaker. He it was who could feel his party's pulse and measure its demands. As I have always believed, he is a very fair man; a man who will endeavor under any circumstances to do what he believes is right, withal an intense party man, and one who, instead of setting himself in the way of a pronounced demand by his party, would seek to answer that demand.

His first duty was to organize the committees of this House and to appoint their chairmen. This is one of the most delicate duties intrusted to the Speaker of the House. The legislation of the country is shaped in the committee-rooms. The voice of the committee is uttered by its chairman. His influence is largely potential; he represents the essential interests committed to his committee, and aside from his membership is looked upon by the country, if he be a man of prominence, as the indication of the policy to be pursued by the committee on matters submitted to it. These chairmanships are the highest honors that the Speaker can confer. They are greatly desired by the ablest men in the House.

Now I have here a list of the committees of the Forty-fourth Congress, with the chairman of each and the section and State from which he comes. I have taken the thirty-three old standing committees of the House, who do its work, who shape legislation, who give tone and character to all that we do here.

COMMITTEES OF THE FORTY-FOURTH CONGRESS WITH SOUTHERN CHAIRMEN.

Elections, Mr. Harris, of Virginia; Pacific Railroad, Mr. Lamar, of Mississippi; Claims, Mr. Bright, of Tennessee; Commerce, Mr.

Hereford, of West Virginia; Post-Office and Post-Roads, Mr. Clark, of Missouri; District of Columbia, Mr. Buckner, of Missouri; Judiciary, Mr. Knott, of Kentucky; Public Expenditures, Mr. Milliken, of Kentucky; Private Land Claims, Mr. Gunter, of Arkansas; Manufactures, Mr. Stone, of Missouri; Agriculture, Mr. Caldwell, of Alabama; Indian Affairs, Mr. Scales, of North Carolina; Naval Affairs, Mr. Whitthorne, of Tennessee; Foreign Affairs, Mr. Swann, of Maryland; Revolutionary Pensions, Mr. Hunton, of Virginia; Railways and Canals, Mr. Jones, of Kentucky; Mines and Mining, Mr. Bland, of Missouri; Education and Labor, Mr. Walker, of Virginia; Revision of the Laws, Mr. Durham, of Kentucky; Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Mr. Stevens, of Georgia; Patents, Mr. Vance, of North Carolina.

COMMITTEES WITH NORTHERN CHAIRMEN.

Ways and Means, Mr. Morrison, of Illinois; Appropriations, Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania; Banking and Currency, Mr. Cox, of New York; Public Lands, Mr. Saylor, of Ohio; War Claims, Mr. Eder, of Illinois; Military Affairs, Mr. Banning, of Ohio; Militia, Mr. Cowan, of Ohio; Territories, Mr. Southard, of Ohio; Invalid Pensions, Mr. Jenks, of Pennsylvania; Public Buildings and Grounds, Mr. Holman, of Indiana; Accounts, Mr. Williams, of Indiana; Library, Mr. Clymer, of Pennsylvania.

In this list I have not taken into account either the small and heretofore unknown committee on expenditures of the different Departments nor the special committees. I take the old standing committees, who always have done and will do the important work of the House of Representatives.

Here it is seen that of these thirty-three committees organized by the Speaker in the first month of this session, twenty-one are put into the hands of gentlemen from the section lately hostile to the Government, and which it is claimed is not seeking to arrogate power in the democratic party; while upon the other side are but twelve committees given to the entire Northern States.

And these twenty-one committees that are so entrusted are not obscure committees. I find among them the Committee of Elections, the first on the list, a committee that largely controls and shapes the membership of this House. The Committee of Claims, with all of the responsibility of dealing justly with good claims and yet of protecting the Treasury from bad ones, is in the list. The important Committee on Commerce, treating some of the largest subjects that the American people deal with. The Committee for the District of Columbia; the Committee on the Judiciary, the great law committee of the House; the Committee on Private Land Claims; the Committee on Manufactures; the Committees on Indian Affairs, on Naval Affairs, on Foreign Affairs, on Railways and Canals, on Mines and Mining, on Education and Labor, and other committees are intrusted to southern men.

And in this first act of the democratic party through its Speaker, indicating where in the future power must be lodged if that party obtains control of the Government. I find that the section of the country from which I come, New England, although she felt the revulsion in 1874 and elected a large delegation of democrats to this Congress, was not awarded a single chairmanship; while Kentucky has four, Missouri as many, Virginia three, and other southern States several each.

I have here an old Directory of Congress in

the days before the war, and I have looked it over to see how committées were apportioned then, and I do not find the South more strongly intrenched than now under the Speaker of this House acting at the dictation of his party at the beginning of the Forty-fourth Congress. Yet we are to be lulled by the talk which we hear that there is no danger of the southern element in the democratic party controlling and dictating its course in the future. Bearing upon this and showing how closely most of these prominent gentlemen were connected with the "lost cause," I give a list of the members of this Congress who were in some way associated with the "confederacy." The list has been made up from the Congressional Directory.

REBEL OFFICERS IN CONGRESS.

Senators—Goldthwaite, Ala., Adjutant General; Jones, Fla., Brigadier General; Gordon, Ga., Major General; Alcorn, Miss., Brigadier General; Coekrell, Mo., Major General; Ransom, N. C., Major General; Key, Tenn., Lieutenant Colonel; Maxey, Tex., Major General and Superintendent Indian Affairs; Withers, Va., Colonel.

Representatives—Williams, Ala., Major; Bradford, Ala., Colonel; Hayes, Ala., Brigadier General; Hewitt, Ala., Colonel; Forney, Ala., Brigadier General; Lewis, Ala., Colonel; Gause, Ark., Colonel; Slemons, Ark., Brigadier General; Gunter, Ark., Colonel; Smith, Ga., Captain; Hartridge, Ga., Colonel; Cook, Ga., Major General; Hill, Ga., Colonel Recruiting Service; Blackburn, Ky., Lieutenant Colonel; Gibson, La., Brigadier General; Ellis, La., Captain; Levy, La., Colonel; Lamar, Miss., Colonel and Minister to Russia; Hooker, Miss., Colonel; Franklin, Mo., Captain; Clark, Mo., Brigadier General; Yeates, N. C., Major; Waddell, N. C., Lieutenant Colonel; Davis, N. C., Captain; Scales, N. C., Brigadier General; Robbins, N. C., Colonel; Vane, N. C., Brigadier General; Dibrell, Tenn., Brigadier General; Whitthorne, Tenn., Adjutant General; Atkins, Tenn., Colonel; Young, Tenn., Colonel; Culberson, Tex., Colonel; Throckmorton, Tex., Brigadier General; Douglas, Va., Major; Cabell, Va., Colonel; Tucker, Va., Captain; Hunton, Va., Brigadier General; Ferry, Va., Brigadier General; Faulkner, W. Va., Adjutant General and Minister to France; Reagan, Tex., Brigadier General and Postmaster General; Goode, Va., Colonel; Hatcher, Mo., Colonel; Singleton, Miss., Inspector General; House, Tenn., Major.

Ex-Members of Rebel Government—Stephens, Ga., Vice President; Reagan, Tex., Postmaster General; Hill, Ga., Senator; Caperton, W. Va., Senator; Ashe, N. C., Senator; House, Tenn., Representative; Goode, Va., Representative; Smith, Ga., Representative; Hatcher, Mo., Representative; Singleton, Miss., Representative; Caldwell, Ala., Solicitor General; Norwood, Ga., State Legislature; Candler, Ga., State Legislature; Tucker, Va., Attorney General; Culberson, Tex., State Legislature; Harris, Ga., State Legislature; Slemons, Ark., State Legislature; Gunter, Ark., State Legislature; Lamar, Miss., Minister to Russia; Dibrell, Tenn., State Legislature; Hunton, Va., State Legislature; Faulkner, W. Va., Minister to France; Harris, W. Va., State Legislature; Maxey, Tex., Superintendent Indian Affairs.

Members of Congress Before Rebellion—Stephens, Ga., Thirty-sixth Congress; Lamar, Miss., Thirty-sixth Congress; Singleton, Miss., Thirty-sixth Congress; Scales, N. C., Thirty-fifth Congress; Atkins, Tenn., Thirty-fifth Congress; Reagan, Tex., Thirty-sixth Congress; Faulkner, W. Va., Thirty-second to Thirty-sixth Congresses; Harris, Va., Thirty-sixth Congress.

In the same direction was the course pursued in the various offices about the House.

Perhaps there is nothing that illustrates

these two propositions, first, the promise of civil-service reform, and then the denial that the South is gradually absorbing the democratic party, than that presented by the post office of this House, where a clean sweep was made.

In the Forty-third Congress the Postmaster was a Union soldier, who had lost a leg at Kenesaw.

But I will give the lists for both the Forty-third and Forty-fourth Congresses:

Henry Sherwood, Postmaster, entered the service in the Second Michigan Cavalry early in the war. He was in all the battles in the West, from Perrysville to the battle of Kenesaw Mountain, in 1864, and lost a leg at the fight at Lattimer's Mill, on the left of Kenesaw.

Joseph F. Wilson, assistant postmaster, entered the service from Illinois, and in one of the battles of the war had his lower jaw entirely shot away.

Francis A. Wardell entered the service in 1861, in a Massachusetts regiment, and was totally disabled by wounds received at the battle of Winchester, Virginia, September 19, 1864.

J. H. Paine entered the Army from Ohio, and served honorably during the war.

R. S. Bishop served in a Michigan regiment during the war, and had his arm shot away by a rebel bullet.

R. S. McMichael, while in service in a Wisconsin regiment, nearly lost his eyesight in the honorable discharge of his duty.

D. B. Bradley enlisted in a Wisconsin regiment in 1861, and was honorably discharged November, 1864.

A. M. Legg, from New York, served during the war in our Navy.

C. M. Thomas, Iowa; J. H. Lytle and W. B. Sessions, New York; J. D. Scrun and D. F. Bishop, Pennsylvania; and Cripti Palmoni, District of Columbia, were appointed from civil life.

The employes of the Forty-fourth Congress are as follows:

James M. Stewart, Postmaster, from Virginia, was captain in the rebel army, and served with J. E. B. Stuart's raiding cavalry.

Edgar Snowden, assistant postmaster, from Virginia, was a press correspondent in the rebel army.

G. W. Roek, Va., served in the rebel army.

G. W. Kennedy, Va., served in the rebel army.

A. W. C. Nowlin, Va., served in the rebel army.

W. H. Robertson, Va., served in the rebel army.

J. R. Fisher, Va., served in the rebel army.

W. B. Lowry, Va., served in the rebel army.

E. C. Glass, Va., served in the rebel army.

The other employes are Richard Allen, Virginia; Edward Estes, New York, who took the modified oath.

I must touch lightly upon this matter of the outside organization of the House.

Here and there individual cases attract attention and deserve mention, both as showing removals without cause and also showing the very superior order of merit introduced by the party just taking possession of the House. For instance we had an old journal clerk, a venerable and accomplished man, who had sat at that desk for thirty years, who had been adopted by a republican administration sixteen years ago, who had sat there as a come-over from a democratic administration. He is a marvel to-day of intelligence and accuracy upon parliamentary law, and was never more needed in this House in the interests of correct legislation than at a time when new hands took the reins. I refer of course to Mr. Barclay. But short shrift was given to him; and there was substituted

for him a pronounced democrat; and in a little while my friends on the other side found as one result of their "civil-service reform" in displacing this veteran that the new incumbent was thriftily putting himself in a position to make merchandise of the important place that he held here.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentlemen allow me a single moment?

Mr. HALE. I find that my time is being consumed so fast that I am afraid I shall not be able to yield any time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Barclay resigned.

Mr. HALE. We all know about his resignation.

Mr. HARRISON. Why did you not state it?

Mr. HALE. I will state it.

Mr. FRANKLIN. You said he was displaced.

Mr. HALE. I say again that he was displaced. When Mr. Barclay found that such was the clamor and push for office upon the Clerk of this House for his place as well as all others, and that his removal was imminent, he resigned, and that will not be denied.

Mr. HARRISON. It is denied.

Mr. HALE. He resigned in order that he might show his own self-respect, as it was very proper he should do.

Mr. HARRISON. It is positively denied.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to correct one statement of the gentleman. Mr. Barclay resigned of his own voluntary accord; and I think I am authorized to say that the Clerk of the House never had any disposition to remove him.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. HALE. I cannot yield further. It was well understood at the time why Mr. Barclay resigned. I wish to do no injustice to our Clerk who has these subordinate officers in charge. The general system of removals showed that nobody would be spared. Mr. Barclay was intimately associated with certain gentlemen at the Clerk's desk whom he wished to remain if he remained and so stated his desire, as I understand, to Mr. Adams, the Clerk. He felt that assurances had been given to him in authoritative quarters that these gentlemen should be retained, and when they were all removed both the desire to remain was gone and also any confidence as to his own much further retention. The way is not important. The journal clerk went out under the system followed here.

The new journal clerk who had been put in by this "reform" House was not a great success. He had borne a good reputation, I learn, before he came into office, but before many weeks it was found that, important and delicate as were his duties, he having in charge the Journal of the House which records our legislation, he had put himself in communication with claims and claim agents throughout the country and proposed to make profit of his position by getting control of certain claims which were before this House, and which depended upon the passage of certain legislation. So my friends on the other side were not able to keep him.

MR. HARRISON. And he was from a State bordering upon that of the gentleman from Maine.

MR. HALE. He was from a State that

had a strong and belligerent democracy, which claimed him as their representative and sent him here to fill an important office.

The following memorandum has been given to me as to the assistant journal clerk whom our reforming friends put into Mr. Clayton's place:

Flanagan, assistant journal clerk, legislated out June 30, was tried by court martial, of which Gov. Hayes was president, in 1864, for resisting draft and encouraging desertion, as editor of an Ohio paper, found guilty, sent to Fort Delaware; which decision was affirmed by Gen. Hooker; and when the war closed he was serving out his sentence.

Here are some of the other officers who in a few weeks were proven unfit. I notice them because of the claim that bad men are to be put out of office and good men put in:

The clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The clerk of the Committee of Ways and Means.

The Doorkeeper of the House.

There were other lesser offices, but I give no time to them.

The clerk of the Committee of Ways and Means was the now rather notorious James P. Hambleton. The place is very important. The clerk possesses all the secrets of this most important committee; secrets sometimes worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to desperate men interested upon the subjects considered in the committee, which reverses and re-arranges our tariff laws and all revenue laws at its pleasure. Mr. Hambleton was, I think, forced upon the chairman of the committee by other influence. He had been a lobbyist here for some years, and, it was charged, had been a blackmailer on northern merchants before the war. But a well-proved act of his showing pronounced sympathy with the most lamentable and tragic act in our history, the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, aroused the newspaper press and particularly the New York *Tribune* and my friend from Illinois, [MR. MORRISON,] the chairman of the committee, removed him, and removed him, I have no doubt, willingly on learning all the facts. To show something of the character of the parties, I will have read the following from the New York *Tribune*:

TURN BACK THE HANDS—MR. HAMBLETON DEMANDS PROOFS—A LETTER FROM THE DEMOCRATIC CLERK OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

To the Editor of the Tribune:

SIR: Judging from your article of this date you seem determined not to receive any statement or explanation as satisfactory. It sometimes happens that "a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." In reply to your first onslaught I authorized your chief correspondent in this city to say that I never had a child or anything else named "John Wilkes Booth." That dispatch appeared in the Tribune as my authorized statement, and the Tribune also, in the same issue, made editorially (in minion type) a quasi retraction. Since that date the Tribune reiterates the charge but presents no proofs. I now say for the last time that the allegation is false and malicious, and if the Tribune has or can get any proof that I, or any member of my family, ever named a child John Wilkes Booth, we say give it to the public without delay. Who are your witnesses and what are they? It is an easy matter for an editor—especially one who fought four years to save the Union—in his

retiracy--glowing with patriotic ardor, to indite gushing philippics over the grave of a dead infant. But it is another thing to produce facts that sustain such a course. This crusade of the anti-democratic press against the clerk of the Committee of Ways and Means is not only unfounded in truth, but it is partisan and malicious, and is the smallest and most contemptible episode in the history of American Politics. The Tribune has been imposed upon by the envious and the malignant; its patriotic indignation has been lashed into a rage at the sight of a Quaker gun, nothing more, nothing less.

The Tribune may also be gratified to know that the clerkship of the Committee of Ways and Means is a matter of small consideration to its present incumbent. The clerk was appointed on the sole recommendation of prominent democrats who had served long and faithfully on this committee, and while the chairman is not responsible for my appointment yet my resignation has always been subject to his will and pleasure. Will the Tribune suggest to the chairman of the Committee of ways and Means some suitable gentleman for his clerk, after learning that he has a family, and what he has named his children? No mistakes should be made. In conclusion, we ask the Tribune if there is anything in either of the new amendments of the Constitution, the reconstruction acts, acts of Congress, proclamations, or military orders that prohibits a man from naming a child anything he chooses? "We are in our father's house," and will never knowingly violate any law or anything done in pursuance thereof. We shall never invade, under any pretext, the domestic circle or the graves of innocents.

JAMES. P. HAMBLETON,

Clerk of Committee of Ways and Means.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8, 1876.

P. S. If there is any additional statement you desire to make, please prepare it and inclose it to your regular Washington correspondent, that I may comply, if possible, with your patriotic demands. J. P. H.

MR. HAMBLETON ACCOMMODATED.

[From the Washington Patriot, Monday July 8, 1872.

DIED.

HAMBLETON.—At the Exchange Hotel, Washington, D. C., on the morning of July 3, 1872, at 10 minutes past seven, of inflammation of the brain, John W. B. Hambleton, aged 6 years, 3 months, and 17 days, youngest son of James P. and Martha L. Hambleton, of Atlanta, Ga.

The case of Doorkeeper Fitzhugh is so well known that I need not give it much time. He was the "bigger man" than Grant. He had been brought here before the democratic caucus because he had been either doorkeeper or sergeant-at-arms of the confederate house of representatives during the war, and that was not a claim to be disregarded. That was a claim with my friends on the other side so overtowering that it was not asked, "Is he honest?" it was not asked, "Can he spell?" it was not asked, "Can he write?" it was not asked, "Is he fitted by attainments and experience for this important place?" But because of his "war record," I suppose, he distanced all competitors in the caucus.

Mr. HARRISON. As soon as we found he was unfitted for the place, we dismissed him.

Mr. HALE. Yes; he was turned out. My friend should not be uneasy.

Mr. FRYE. Cannot the gentleman from Illinois be kept quiet?

Mr. HALE. But I must come to weightier matters. The House was confronted with the condition of the country. The majority had the country before it, in whatever condition it was, in whatever condition of depression

were all the industries of the country, with all needed reforms to be set on foot. The South claimed that the whole republican policy there was wrong, that grievous errors and sins and crimes were the accompaniments of that policy, and that a drastic change was demanded. Here was an opening for some broad plan of legislation that the House at least might send to the country. But on the day that the House assembled we witnessed the faculty and the power of the democracy to grapple with a great subject; for it was deliberately proposed here upon the question of swearing in a member of this House to open what is one of the wisest things in the record of the republican party, the adjustment of the Louisiana difficulties—the Wheeler compromise—which had given to New Orleans and the State of Louisiana a peace which she had not known for years. I am glad to say that my almost always wise friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] was not in accord with the movement and opposed it. But it was urged by almost all the leaders of his party that this beneficent measure of settlement should be thrown open, and it was voted down only by the solid strength of this side of the House, with the careful and moderate men, few in number, on the other side under the lead of Mr. HOLMAN. So disastrous was that experiment, so pronounced was the defeat, that from that day to this there has been no plan nor suggestion as to southern measures reported from any committee that I have ever heard of.

Other questions confronted us. The question of finance was upon every man's mind, and almost upon every man's tongue.

American commerce, Mr. Speaker, it was claimed upon that side, languished, as it undoubtedly does languish, largely from causes that are world-wide, and not influenced by legislation in this Hall. But it was claimed there that it languished because it suffocated in the grasp of an incompetent party; and the country looked to see what measure would be attempted by the dominant party in this House upon that great interest. The questions, too, of currency—its uses, its medium, its kind, its limitation—were all before the House when it assembled.

The House left all of these questions. It trod them under foot. It ignored them as of little account or confessed its incompetency by refusing to deal with them, and embarked in a wild crusade of investigation. Now here with a party in power during four presidential terms there was an opportunity undoubtedly for some good to be done. It was by no means new ground. No republican Congress had for the last ten years failed to investigate when real evils appeared and to censure and punish both friend and foe alike. But there was yet some opportunity for improvement, and when the crusade was started the country looked for some good out of the effort.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the House sent thirty-three committees into investigating duties, which monopolized their time and drove out all other subjects, yet the method and manner was such that from the beginning the whole movement was paralyzed. Then first was adopted as the almost unvarying policy—I believe the Committee on Ways and Means was the only exception at first—what had only been in rare cases ever attempted before, the sitting of these com-

mittees in secret; investigations conducted with closed doors. Parties who were investigated found, months after secret investigation had been set afoot, for the first time that they were under accusation. The minority members of the different committees had the padlock of secrecy put upon them, because of a false notion of the honor due to the committee by them as members.

Secret meetings of the members of the majority upon the committees were frequently held, and one result of all this was that when any facts were brought out that affected any prominent member of the party of the majority in the House the investigation was suppressed. No committee cared to follow up the claim of the Kentucky Railroad which had been forced through one of the Departments when it was learned that a leading democratic aspirant for the Presidency was implicated. When it found that John Roach had contributed money to the election of a democratic member upon this floor no attention was called to it. When Contractor Swift told the committee that his largest contribution had been in aid of democratic elections the committee felt that they had heard enough. And Mr. Commissioner Davenport opened up the condition of the elections in New York City under democratic rule so effectually that another committee, like the California hunter, drew off from the trail because "it was getting altogether too fresh." But whenever any slur could be put upon the hitherto fair reputation of a prominent republican the committees were eager and anxious to bring it forth.

Let me give an instance or two of these investigations and of the manner in which the democratic party conducted them. It has been the party that heretofore has set up loud claims of devotion to the individual and private rights of the citizen. One of the first things that one of the committees of this House did under the general authority given it to investigate everything was to send to the paper-mills where a mass of telegrams from the telegraph offices had been sent and to secure them for the use of the committee. Why, Mr. Speaker, one cause of the success of the electric telegraph has been the fidelity of its employees to the citizen who commits his most secret communications to the companies. This confidence is a thing that ramifies all business and social life. But the investigating committees of this House broke through all that, seized the dispatches, and spent their time searching for private messages that had been brought from the vats of the paper-makers.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the secrets captured, the information there gained, these committees had no more right to, as a matter of property, than they have to a gentleman's purse. They gained them in no better way than if they had stolen into a gentleman's house and had hidden behind his door or under his bed, and had listened to all the confidences and secrecies of his household. Let me give an instance of the craze that followed this hunting up of private records. A Cabinet minister, whose wife was at the seaside, received a dispatch something like this: "Arrived safely; baby well. You must decide about the cook." To the committee this was a vastly mysterious dispatch, and the Cabinet minister re-

ceived from the chairman of the investigating committee a curt note, copying the dispatch and calling upon him to furnish the cipher for its interpretation. Think of the gross maladministration [laughter] concealed under this dispatch, and how the chairman of the committee must have racked his brain to gather its true and hidden meaning.

Can any craze go further than this? Why, sir, the famous absurdity of Sergeant Buzz-Fuzz—"Mutton Chops and Tomato Sauce"—is common sense compared with this committee investigating a Department of the Government.

But we have gone on far enough to ascertain that one result followed from all this. It was a thing that my friends on the other side hated to look in the face at first, hated to provide for in appropriation bills. But it soon became evident that the bills for all this had to be paid. The city of Washington was full of men who had been summoned here as witnesses from every corner in the land, some of whom wanted to testify and return to their homes, while others preferred to wait while their fee-bills rolled up. The Sergeant-at-Arms had sent his messengers out in all directions. The Government Printing Office had from the beginning a surfeit of matter thrust upon it for printing. The committees had to be given clerks, and their salaries had to be raised. This very day, on a report from the Committee on Accounts, the salary of the clerk of one of these committees was raised.

Now, I wonder if gentlemen know, with all their claim of economy, how they have illustrated it in this House, where they have had full swing. I had the figures made up for me four days ago, and I found that there were then thirty-three clerks of committees of this House under pay, while never in the time of republican administration were there ever more than twenty-nine. And since that list was made up for me two more have been added.

The democratic party has been, and is now, running the most expensive session of Congress that the American Republic has ever seen. I have here a list of a few of the items of expense in some of the committees, only including fees, mileage, and per diem pay of witnesses. It is only a small part of the investigating bills:

Ways and Means, \$307.60; Pacific Railroad, \$132.90; Commerce, \$259.16; Post Offices and Post Roads, \$2,381.21; District of Columbia, \$1,472.90; Judiciary, \$4,174.28; Indian Affairs, \$5,801.50; Military Affairs, \$290.10; Naval Affairs, \$5,602.17; Foreign Affairs, \$669.87; Invalid Pensions, \$81.70; Public Buildings and Grounds, \$286.10; Printing, \$928.74. Expenditures: State Department, \$325.47; Treasury Department, \$2,081.07; War Department, \$8,203.74; Navy Department, \$535.98; Post Office Department, \$936.60; Interior Department, \$4,509.58; Public Buildings, \$45.86; Department of Justice, \$1,788.74; Reform in Civil Service, \$2,650.05; Rules, \$10.60. Select committees: Texas Frontier, \$1,410.72; Freedman's Bank, \$1,027.29; Real Estate Pool, \$1,377.39; Whisky Frauds, \$3,261.15; Federal Offices in Louisiana, \$9,000.00; Charges against Judge Wylie, \$218.95; Charges against Clerk Adams, \$16.00; Impeachment of Belknap, \$316.90. Total, \$60,104.66.

It does not include any of the largest items of these expenditures; it does not include anything for printing the testimony. It includes nothing for stenographers, clerks, stationery. It undoubtedly does not cover one-tenth part

of the additional expenditures imposed on the country by the action of this House.

Why, sir, ordinarily we employ but two stenographers to report for our committees. We have paid this session (I counted them up the other day) seventeen. The appropriation bill for the sundry civil expenses of the Government has several pages decorated with items to pay for services upon these committees. I venture to say, and I measure my words, that the additional expenses of this House over and above the ordinary expenses of years immediately preceding, when they are all in for the entire session, will aggregate in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000. A very large item of this is of course the printing, the cost of which cannot now be told.

Had great results been reached all this money might be well afforded. But setting aside the result of the War Department investigation where Republicans contributed to the end as freely as Democrats, the outcome of the investigation is a mass of partisan reports to be used for campaign purposes, and while no money of the Government is shown to have been stolen by officials, it is proved that the defalcations and losses are smaller than at any period in our history.

The democratic party claims, and that is about all that is left to it out of this session, that it has reduced the general expenditures of the Government. Now that is, if true, a claim that should be admitted, and our friends on the other side should be given due credit. I wish that I had more time to give than I have now; but I cannot pass it by without noticing it, although my hour is waning.

Now, what does that claim amount to in truth? Reckoning from the last year's appropriations, the reductions made in the appropriation bills of this session, when it shall have drawn its long length to an end, will perhaps amount to not far from \$25,000,000. To do this the consular system has been put in peril, the Navy and the Army have been put upon short rations, laborers upon Government works have been cut off, and small salaries have been reduced. In a few days almost a thousand helpless men and women in Washington will be turned upon the streets.

Now the Committee on Appropriations and my friend the chairman of that committee [Mr. RANDALL] will claim that I have admitted that the democratic party in this House has reduced the people's burdens by the amount of \$25,000,000. Sir, I do no such thing. I start with this as my cardinal proposition; no man can tell what credit should be given to this House of Representatives until the closing day of its term on the 4th day of March, 1877. It is no new thing that the good which has been done in the first session of a Congress has been undone in its second session.

The American people will wait before this House is given credit for a reduction of \$25,000,000 in expenditures until it sees the waning, dying days of this Congress; so first, as entering into this discussion of the actual amount of appropriations, are all the subjects of appropriation that have been postponed. There have been some reductions, some advisable, desirable reductions, which I am glad that I have helped to make. But when it is found how much of this \$25,000,000 is simply a postponement of needed and neces-

sary expenditures, then some correct rule can be adopted in awarding credit to this House.

But there is another matter that will have to be considered; not in this session, but in the next, in order to determine the question of what this House shall have credit for. I refer to the immense mass of southern claims, private and public, that are lodged in the committee rooms of this House, as my friend from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] said the other day, to be launched upon this House after the elections.

My friend from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] a member, along with myself, of the Committee on Appropriations, brought out in the early part of the session, in a colloquy upon this floor, what was intended upon that side of the House. It covered the Southern Pacific Railroad and the levees of the Mississippi; and he only fought shy, on motion from wiser members of his party, when I taxed him with complicity in the scheme for having the cotton tax refunded out of the Treasury.

Mr. SINGLETON. Will the gentleman allow me a single word?

Mr. HALE. I cannot yield now, because I have so little time. The gentleman will have ample opportunity for reply,

Mr. SINGLETON. I only want to say—

Mr. HALE. I cannot yield. I will put into my speech the colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi as it appears in the *Record*, so that the gentleman shall not be misquoted: [From the Congressional Record, Feb. 4, 1876.]

Mr. SINGLETON. * * *. Now, sir, let us be done with this. I came here as your brother; I came here as your friend; I came here with the purpose of promoting the interests of my own people and yours. I shall strive in all my acts to build up the ruined South. I want you before this Congress adjourns to assist me in two or three schemes directed to that end, which I believe you will do, because your own interests imperatively demand such a course. I want to build up the Mississippi levees and reclaim its alluvial soil, which will prove a more fruitful source of wealth to the United States than the Black Hills of the Territories or the mines of California, because it is from this inexhaustible soil of the delta of the Mississippi River that we can raise 7,000,000 bales of cotton a year if properly protected from overflow. We expect to ask a small sum for this work that will develop this alluvial basin and enable us to purchase from you the goods we formerly purchased and contribute largely to the expenses of the Government.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman state what the other schemes are that people desire?

Mr. SINGLETON. I will. I am not afraid to tell it anywhere. Another one is a Pacific railroad.

Mr. HALE. The Southern Pacific railroad?

Mr. SINGLETON. Yes; and then again I want the jetty system carried out at New Orleans which promises to admit vessels of the largest tonnage up to the wharves in that city. And if we can get these things accomplished you will find the South blossoming like the rose. You will find sources of wealth to you and the whole country that you never dreamed of.

Mr. HALE. Is not the refunding of the cotton tax another object which the gentleman desires?

Mr. SINGLETON. Well, I do not propose to discuss that now. When the proposition comes before the House I will give my views upon it.

Mr. WILLIS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Maine that the democratic party do not propose to help the South by building a Pacific railroad. The republican

party may do so if they feel disposed; but, so far as we are concerned, we do not intend to indulge in any subsidies, the republican example to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HALE. I wanted the gentleman to state as a representative of the southern democracy what the democratic party, of which it constitutes a large portion, expect to carry before Congress adjourns. I thank him for the candor with which he has answered my question and the monition he has given the country.

Mr. SINGLETON. I stated that I had three schemes in view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would inquire of the gentleman from Maine by what authority he says that the gentleman from Mississippi is the representative of the southern democracy here?

Mr. HALE. I did it because it was not an assumption on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi, for he is not an assuming man, but he claims to state for the southern people as their representative, speaking distinctly for them, complaining of the republican party, that they required certain "schemes," and I use his words, that the South wished to accomplish before Congress adjourns. I wished to know what they were, and I thank the gentleman again for the monition he has given to the country, and especially does the gentleman from Mississippi represent the southern people, because he has been selected as one of their representatives on the Money Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a carefully compiled list of southern claims now suspended in the committees of this House. They cover every imaginable variety of subjects from a claim for the price of a single mule up to the destruction of iron manufactories that were engaged in furnishing materials of war for the rebel armies. They come from every southern State and almost every county of every southern State. There is no member from the South, so far as I know, who has not introduced such claims here; and the important point is that all these bills are introduced because the member introducing them, whether he believes them right or wrong, is pushed and driven by his constituents.

Mr. EDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on this subject.

Mr. HALE. I must decline to yield. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that it will be safe to vote for these bills, the same influence that has driven these members will drive them to vote for their passage. It is an inevitable law which will dominate that side of the House, and after a little while, when the public mind shall have become gradually familiarized with the concession, as in the old times it did with certain exactions of the South, the northern democracy will become acquiescent and, provided the party gains power, will consent to the passage of these bills. They aggregate about \$160,000,000 of those that are already here. Does anybody believe that the South has not an interest in these claims being paid? Does anybody believe that if it has control of the Government through the democratic party it will allow its members to rest day or night on this floor until these bills are passed?

Mr. LAWRENCE. And many of these are simply test claims, which if allowed will be followed by others to a vast amount.

Mr. HALE. Of course, as my friend from Ohio suggests, many of these are simply representative claims, and if one passes, it involves the payment of twenty or fifty times as much more, which will be covered by the

same principle. These are only the courier, the advance-guard, the feeler, the skirmisher that is sent out to feel the line, and find whether it can be broken. Five hundred millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, will not meet all these claims when we begin to pay them.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Five hundred million dollars would not cover the total amount of these claims, without reference to the claims for emancipated slaves.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, he who lives long enough—provided always that the democratic party gets control of all the branches of the Government—will see what I here predict come to pass. If anybody doubts, let him wait and see for himself.

I cannot give a full list of their claims, because it would occupy whole pages of the *Record*. Here are some of them:

One of them, introduced in the Senate by Mr. JOHNSTON, of Virginia, appropriates \$199,228.24 to pay certain "loyal" citizens of Loudoun County, Virginia, two hundred and six in number, "in consideration of their property destroyed by fire by the military authority of the United States in conformity with an order of Major General Sheridan, dated November 27, 1864." This is the famous order in which Sheridan, after directing General Merritt to operate with his division of cavalry against the guerrillas in a certain district of country, says:

"This section has been the hot-bed of lawless bands who have from time to time depredated upon small parties on the line of army communication, on safeguards left at houses, and on troops. Their real object is plunder and highway robbery. To clear the country of these parties that are bringing destruction upon the innocent as well as their guilty supporters by their cowardly acts, you will consume and destroy all forage and subsistence, burn all barns and mills and their contents, and drive off all stock. This order must be literally executed, bearing in mind, however, that no dwellings are to be burned and that no personal violence be offered the citizens. The ultimate result of the guerrilla system of warfare is the total destruction of all private rights in the country occupied by such parties. This destruction may as well commence at once, and the responsibility of it must rest upon the authorities at Richmond, who have acknowledged the legitimacy of guerrilla bands."

By Mr. FAULKNER, of West Virginia: A bill to pay Abram H. Herr \$21,067.51 for the use of land and buildings on the island of Virginus, in the Shenandoah River at Harper's Ferry, by the Quartermaster's Department, from February 26, 1862, to February 1, 1866.

By the same member: A bill to pay Wilcey Lodge, I. O. O. F., of Charlestown, West Virginia, \$3,547.50 for the destruction of buildings, furniture and regalia by fire.

By the same member: A bill to pay the German Evangelical church of Martinsburgh, West Virginia, \$2,500 for the destruction of the building and furniture by fire "through the carelessness of the military forces of the United States."

By the same member: A bill to pay Abijah Daily, of Grant county, West Virginia, \$2,453.87 for losses in property sustained by him during the war.

By Mr. REAGAN, of Texas: A bill to pay J. A. Warren, of Tyler county, Texas, \$3,150 for eight mules and three horses taken from him by order of General Laila.

By Mr. PHILLIPS, of Missouri: A bill to pay Thomas Plant, of Booneville, Missouri, \$902 for boots, shoes, leather and tools taken from his shop by United States troops.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE, of Tennessee: A bill to pay John E. Tulloss \$12,982.04 for the burning of his buildings and destruction of prop-

erty near Franklin, Tennessee, [a battle field] by United States troops.

By Senator JOHNSTON, of Virginia: A bill to pay Peters & Reed \$15,170.89, balance due them for labor and material furnished by them as contractors at the Norfolk navy-yard in 1860. (This bill was passed by the House last session, but was not reached in season for consideration by the Senate.)

By Mr. HUNTON, of Virginia: A bill to pay James Green, of Alexandria, \$37,750. (No consideration mentioned.)

By the same member: A bill directing the auditing and payment of the claim of R. B. Hackey for carrying mails in 1861. Amount not stated.)

By Mr. WHITTHORNE, of Tennessee: A bill to pay the officers and men of the First Regiment and of the Ninth Battalion of Tennessee Cavalry, Confederate States army, for their horses which, by the terms of surrender to General Sherman in North Carolina, they were allowed to retain, but were taken from them on their way home, at Strawberry Plains, Tennessee, by General Stoneman.

By the same member: A bill to pay \$42,271.34 to certain mail contractors in Tennessee for services up to June 8, 1861. [A claim long pending.] The second section of this bill contains the following sweeping provision: "That all laws conflicting with the payment of these claims, and which payment is hereby directed to be made, be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

By Mr. HOUSE, of Tennessee: A bill to pay James M. Hinton, of Davidson county, Tennessee, \$2,508 for "board and so forth" of certain colored men who were taken from his custody when sheriff, and employed on the fortifications of the Federal Army near Nashville, in 1862.

By Mr. ATKINS, of Tennessee: A bill to pay \$13,000 to Bethel College, Tennessee, for occupation of and injury done to the college buildings and property by Federal troops.

It is noticeable that in only two out of the twenty-five cases is it even claimed that the parties interested were loyal citizens during the war.

Next comes an exceedingly important class of bills—those relating to cotton claims, of which five have been introduced. First is the old bill to refund the taxes on raw cotton, involving an appropriation of \$68,072,388.79.

Four bills have been introduced—one by Senator MERRIMON, of North Carolina, two by Mr. VANCE, of North Carolina, and one by Mr. HANCOCK, of Texas—restoring to the pension rolls all persons whose names were stricken therefrom for disloyalty, under the act of February 4, 1862. One of Mr. VANCE's bills goes much further, and repeals not only the act of February 4, 1862, but the statute prohibiting the payment of claims of disloyal persons [section 3480, Revised Statutes] "and all other laws of similar character and purport." In the same bill occurs the remarkable phrase, "the war between the States, generally called the rebellion." If it was simply a war "between the States," by what rule of law or logic can the United States be held liable to pay such claims as VANCE's bill proposes to admit; to repeal the statute prohibiting certain payments to disloyal persons; to restore to the 1812 pension roll the names of persons stricken off for disloyalty; and for the relief of owners and purchasers of lands sold for direct taxes in insurrectionary States? The most important among the more recent measures proposed is a bill introduced by JOHN RANDOLPH TUCKER to repeal the section of the Revised Statutes which prohibits the appointment to any position in the Army of persons who have served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the confederate government or of any of the States in insurrection.

I select these as my eye runs hurriedly down the long list. It is a fearful account that

these gentlemen mean that we shall settle some day.

In looking over the record of this session, I discover many things in which the party in power here has departed from its old traditions and principles. It stood for years as the advocate of the rights of the citizen, as the defender of the powers of the courts, the sanctity of the writ of *habeas corpus*. But this winter, with power unbridled and uncontrolled, the writ of *habeas corpus* has been cast into contempt and the adjudication of a high court has been disputed and sought to be nullified.

Mr. Hallet Kilbourn, of whom I know nothing except that he is an American citizen, came into conflict with one of the investigating committees upon some question as to disclosing names and producing private books and papers. He was committed for contempt by the order of this House, and resorted, as any citizen may do, to the intervention of the courts. The House disputed every step and employed counsel to represent it. Both upon the return and upon the final question of discharge under the writ of *habeas corpus* which had been invoked the petitioner was sustained and released. It had been a fair trial and the House had been beaten. But Mr. Kilbourn, having established the strength of the process and having no desire to withhold proper testimony, then communicated to the House his willingness to testify, and the gentleman from Mississippi [MR. WELLS] sought to bring him before the proper committee with the result shown by this extract from the report of proceedings in the House of Representatives, May 2, 1876.

HALLET KILBOURN.

MR. WELLS, of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Real-Estate Pool be directed to accept the offer of Hallet Kilbourn to appear before that committee to answer any inquiries relating to such real-estate pool and to furnish such information to said committee as the books in his possession may contain, and the said committee are directed to examine said Hallet Kilbourn and his books."

MR. RANDALL. I move that that resolution be laid on the table; that is the right way to treat it.

MR. WELLS, of Mississippi. I call for the yeas and nays on that motion.

MR. HOLMAN. I rise to a question of order. I did not yield the floor for the purpose of the introduction of anything for action. The gentleman from Mississippi [MR. WELLS] did not certainly understand that I yielded the floor when about to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the appropriation bill, to allow him to have the yeas and nays on a proposition like this.

MR. WELLS, of Mississippi. The point of order comes certainly too late.

THE SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Indiana did not make his objection in time.

MR. HOLMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi certainly understood that I yielded the floor simply for the introduction of measures for reference, and not for action.

MR. WELLS, of Mississippi. I understood that I had the floor to offer the resolution. I did offer it, and a motion has been made to lay it on the table, and on that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

MR. RANDALL. The right way to treat it is to treat it with contempt.

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the call of the roll.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I want to make an inquiry of the Chair. Can this resolution come before this body without unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understood that unanimous consent was given, because no one objected when he put the question, and the Chair put the question distinctly to the House,

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] objected. I heard him.

Mr. HOLMAN. I tried to object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did not hear the gentleman, although he was waiting for objections.

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The question was taken on Mr. RANDALL's motion; and there were—yeas 133, nays 84, not voting 63; as follows:

* * * * *

Mr. Speaker, I might cite instance after instance where the dominant party here has sought to override rights heretofore respected and unquestioned. It has conducted its investigations in secret, and has ordered the head of a Department to communicate all facts known to him, without regard to the importance of secrecy in detective operations against knaves and thieves. It has demanded the custody of departmental papers, sometimes if given up to be put in charge of discharged incompetent employees who had been adopted by the committees as clerks or messengers. In its demands upon Cabinet ministers and their subordinates it has been exacting, imperious, and not infrequently rude and insolent. I commend to its consideration the letter of President Jackson to Henry S. Foote, formerly chairman of the committee to investigate general charges of abuse against the executive department as applicable to the present methods of democratic inquiries. The following sentences will indicate its character:

The heads of Departments may answer such requests as they please, provided they do not withhold their own time and that of the officers under their direction from public business. I shall direct them to devote themselves to their duties in preference to any illegal and unconstitutional call for information, no matter from what source it may come, and however anxious they may be to meet it. For myself, I shall repel all such attempts as an invasion of the principles of justice as well as of the Constitution, and I shall esteem it my sacred duty to the people of the United States to resist them as I would the establishment of a Spanish inquisition. If, after all the severe accusations contained in various speeches of yourself and your associates, you are unwilling of your own accord to bring specific charges, then I request your committee to call yourself and your associates and every other member of Congress who made general charge of corruption to testify before God and the country whether you or they knew of any specific corruption or abuse of trust in the Executive Departments, and, if so, what it was. If you are

able to point to any case where there is the slightest reason to suspect corruption and abuse of trust, no obstacle which I can remove shall be interposed to prevent the fullest scrutiny by all legal means. The offices of all the Departments will be opened to you, and every facility furnished for this purpose. I shall, on the one hand, cause every possible facility consistent with law and justice to be given to the investigation of specific, tangible charges; and, on the other, shall repudiate all attempts to invade the just rights of the Executive Departments and of the individuals composing the same. If, after all your clamor, you will make no specific charges, or bring no proof of such as are made, you and your associates must be regarded by the good people of the United States as the authors of unfounded calumnies, and the public servants you have assailed will, in the estimation of all honorable men, stand fully acquitted.

If I had more time, Mr. Speaker, I should be glad to go into the account of the repeated assaults made upon the national credit in the seven different attempts, under the lead of prominent democrats upon this floor, to repeal or nullify the policy of an early resumption of specie payments, to which this Administration is committed. They culminated on Saturday last in a bill which repeals the date fixed for resumption by the act of January, 1875; and so much time had already been consumed in doing nothing for eight long months that to this important measure but two hours of debate was allowed, and it was then pushed through under the lash of the previous question.

In the meantime all the material interests of the country are left neglected. A tariff bill reducing taxation has been reported, but the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means lets it sleep in the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Bristow's recommendation for refunding the national debt, by which at least \$17,000,000 yearly in interest paid can be saved, is passed by unheeded. An Indian war of such magnitude as has not been seen for a generation breaks out at the time when the House of Representatives is reducing the Army and crippling the whole Indian service. The amendment to the Constitution offered by my former colleague, [Mr. Blaine,] relating to sectarian schools, remained until in the last week it was brought up and passed without debate, no interchange of views being allowed, because it had been determined that no expression of hostility should be permitted from the democratic side of the House.

The last days of this session, Mr. Speaker, are upon us. Your party has had its day in court. For nearly nine months the American people have looked upon this body as it has drifted and hopelessly struggled on with elements in it which, while useless for any present good, have sounded a constant alarm of future dangers.

Condition of the Country and Claims of Parties to Public Confidence.

EXTRACT FROM THE SPEECH

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. HURLBUT,

OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SATURDAY, JULY 29, 1876.

The House being as in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for debate only—

Mr. HURLBUT said:

MR. SPEAKER: We are now approaching the end of this most "weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable" session, and it may not be amiss to look back before we separate and review the course we have been pursuing.

I fear, sir, we shall find few fruits to gather, slight harvest in sound grain for the labor and time expended. But those we represent may take warning at least by the shortcomings of this Congress, and see to it that the public interests are not again committed into the hands of a party which has been so lavish of promises in advance and so barren of performance in the time of trial.

The facetious gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] laid aside some weeks ago his quips and jests and condescended to the sphere of simple fact when, with a sweeping gesture including all of his own side of the House, he solemnly declared that "this is the day of small things." The ludicrous truthfulness of the statement rendered his remark an example of the highest kind of unconscious humor, fit to be reproduced in the next issue of "Why We Laugh." The evidences were all around him, and especially in the "masterly inactivity" of his own committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nearly two years since a great popular election was held. Many causes combined to bring about changes in the public mind. Depression in business affairs, stagnation of currency, failures of mercantile enterprise, manufacturing overdone, building of great railways stopped; all these were charged as due to the policy and practice of the party in power. All elements of discontent and division naturally gravitated to the Democratic party, the chronic grumblers of twenty years. Then there is always a considerable element which wearies of anything continuous and uniform, and seeks change and variety by natural appetite, and this element is always large in this country, and it is to it that is due the apparent impossibility of any settled, continuous, and uniform policy.

These hosts were like those that gathered to David in the cave of Adullam.

The press of the country in many instances devoted itself to the consideration of ephemeral questions, and forgot the grave differences that rest, and must always rest, on eternal principles of right and wrong.

The Republican party was arraigned everywhere before the great tribunal of the people;

and in the exercise of that broad license, which the freedom of elections gives and requires, it was charged with all the sins and shortcomings of individual members; it was alleged to have outlived its usefulness, to have had its day, to have performed its purpose, and that its paramount necessity now was to die out of the way of the newly reorganized Democracy, whose mission it was to cure all evils; to restore all waste places; to make all citizens free, equal, and contented; to sweep out all vice, public and private, and to restore the dominion of the Constitution and the laws.

What promises, Mr. Speaker, from the party press, the party conventions, and at the hustings! Promises are the cheapest of all cheap currency; they cost nothing to make, nothing to scatter lavishly and broadcast and as some one says, "Promises are the money of fools." "Let the Democrats into power," said they, "and the good times will come; official corruption shall be stopped; business shall be revived; fields shall groan with golden harvests, foreign commerce be restored; internal transportation shall be simplified and cheapened; money shall be solid, abundant, and cheap; values shall be restored; taxes shall be reduced, retrenchment inaugurated, and the Government conducted on the soundest and most economical plans. The South shall groan no more; the great problem of labor and capital, the great struggle of life and liberty, still going on in that section, shall be harmoniously settled, and all feuds and quarrels of race, citizenship, or ownership of property shall disappear under the overshadowing and benignant wings of the new Democracy." A real civil-service reform should be effected; Cæsarism, personal government, offices as rewards for personal service, all these and all other evil things should perish before the dawn of the new day.

These were among the inducements held out to the people to glorify the beginning of the second century by the ingress of a Democratic majority into the House of Representatives, and these, with not a little of that judicious violence which the Anglo-Saxon deems himself privileged to use toward a weaker people and which was used so far as deemed necessary in more than one State of the South—these causes and these means brought the present majority into this House.

First and foremost among the partisan cries was that of universal corruption among Republican office-holders. A charge easy to make; for general condemnations are the

currency; reduced to gold the amount is a little over \$522,000,000 for domestic products, and the whole exports in gold value is \$537,000,000, showing an increase in the total exports, gold value, of about \$24,000,000 over those of the previous fiscal year, and about \$77,000,000 over the imports of the present year.

The imports of specie in the last fiscal year amounted to \$15,530,648, and the exports to \$69,139,066, showing an excess of exports of \$53,608,418. By adding this amount to the excess of merchandise exported, namely, \$77,000,000, the total excess of exports of merchandise and specie over imports during the year is about \$130,000,000.

These figures are approximately accurate and will probably be found to vary not more than \$2,000,000 from the correct ones when the accounts for June shall have been received and compiled.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWARD YOUNG,
Chief of Bureau.

Hon. J. A. KASSON, M. C., *Washington.*

Thus the work of preparation goes on. One of the bankers before our committee, in answer to the suggestion of my honorable friend from New York, testified that the banks had made already large preparations, particularly his own, and said other banks in New York had done the same. Your bank-vaults are crowded with a surplus of paper money, and you have not allowed this Government to provide for its redemption by funding and cancellation, even on the sole condition that the people themselves wish to surrender and cancel their paper money. You have refused the right to the people, which the original act gave them, of funding the greenbacks, a right which gave them so much value under the funding act. And you still refuse to return that right to them. Not this side of the House, but the other has refused to do that.

Mr. WILLIS rose.

Mr. KASSON. Excuse me now. And we have proposed to reduce the expenses of the public debt further. In the Ways and Means Committee has been pending for months a bill passed by the Senate enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce our rate of interest from 6 to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and that bill is not reported. Another proposition has been to reduce it to 4 per cent.—

Mr. MORRISON. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. KASSON, (continuing,) — by the extension of the time of maturity as an equivalent for the diminution of interest, and that is not reported to the House.

Mr. MORRISON. Does not the gentleman from Iowa know that the Treasury has at its disposal now three hundred millions of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fifteen-year bonds; and seven hundred millions 4 per cent. thirty-year bonds undisposed of?

Mr. KASSON. Precisely; and the Secretary's letter told the committee they could not be negotiated, as they needed some ten years added to the time when they matured as an equivalent for the reduction of the interest, and no report has been made to the House on the subject. Ah, does it lie in the mouths of the opponents of specie resumption to say the fault rests with the republicans, and we cannot resume in 1879 with the measures they can yet submit for our action prior to that time?

Sir, I care nothing for that identical day.

The 2d of January is as good as the 1st to me; and the 25th of December prior to the 1st as good as the 1st of January. There is no cabalistic effect in the 1st day of January. But the significance, the dangerous significance—and no man knows it better than Governor Tilden—of this proposition is that it leaves no port to sail to and no time at which your arrival shall be expected.

Mr. GARFIELD. And no promise.

Mr. KASSON. As that distinguished politician stated in his letter laid upon our desk this morning, "with a good pilot at the helm—S. J. T., to wit—if you start on a voyage for Liverpool you are sure to arrive there." But he is taking Liverpool out of the resumption act, and proposes to make a voyage only "for Cowes and a market." [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, his letter and the claims set up by his friends of being honestly devoted to the resumption of specie payments have yet to be canvassed by the people of the United States. The platform is an evasion. A large party in this country demands the entire repeal of the resumption act and want no resumption at all. They are honest. They believe in poor money, and they take the proper steps to arrive at it. But when a gentleman believes in good money, which can be made good in only one way, then he is not justified in striking a blow at one of the most essential features of the resumption act without substituting an equivalent measure.

I have not time of course to cover the whole ground of this debate. The bill which the committee have attacked in part contains several provisions for the resumption of specie payments besides that of which they propose the repeal. And the other words of that act will remain, of course, standing unsupported by this other clause and emasculated of all vigor by this repeal, leaving us all afloat as far as the public confidence in future resumption is concerned. The gentleman from New York, who I think has an honorable purpose in respect to the resumption of specie payments—I refer to Mr. HEWITT—announces the fact that in the passage of that act the honor of the country was committed to its execution, but condemns what he calls the haste with which it was adopted. Is it possible that that gentleman, admitting that the honor of the country has been constitutionally pledged, is himself willing to aid in striking this blow at that honor in the presence of the world? Can any man who believes that the country is bound to exhaust all honorable efforts to arrive at that result, can such a gentleman vote to abolish this clause in the act until all possible measures to give it effect have been tried and found wanting?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I beg to remind the gentleman that that was the exact statement I made.

Mr. KASSON. Am I to understand that the gentleman is opposed to this repeal?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Certainly. I announced my position to-day, and moved a substitute.

Mr. KASSON. Then I beg to apply my remarks to the other gentlemen who accept his premises but do not honorably accept his conclusions.

We stand, then, in the presence of a desirable object, for which a certain provision

has been made by existing laws. And in that condition of things, without avowing their hostility to the object of the law, gentlemen are here proposing to take away that part of the law which is vital to the rest and without which the remainder cannot be executed, and are doing it, to quote the platform on which they stand, because it is a "hindrance to resumption." Now, sir, look for a moment at the political deceit of that proposition. They say that a law which declares that resumption shall take effect by a certain time and does not say that it shall not come prior to that time is a hindrance to the result to be arrived at. Is that consistent with your two arguments that no preparation has been made and that it is not possible to resume by the time named? If there is any significance in terms, this must be a hindrance, because without it you would arrive at resumption quicker. Will you make this argument in Indiana? Will you say that you are going to resume specie payments before the 1st of January, 1879? How will you use it on the stump in Indiana and in New York? Will you not, on the contrary, say in the West simply that Tilden is for the repeal of the resumption act and Hendricks is for the repeal of the resumption act? Will you not say in New York and the East that it means to arrive at resumption sooner than 1879? And will you not tell the greenbackers of Indiana that they must come and help elect these candidates in order to defeat the resumption of specie payments? Sir, that clause of the platform struck me with more than opposition; it struck me with a feeling, I hope I may be permitted to say, of disgust. That the law should be said to be positively a hindrance to resumption when they do not suggest anything except its repeal to help resumption, that seems to me a positive and direct evasion of the responsibility under which that party stands to the country. It is a two-faced declaration, worthy of the politician trained in the school of Martin Van Buren.

Mr. Tilden says in his "message," as some gentleman has called it, based as I suppose upon its length, that—

To amass the requisite quantities—

Alluding to an accumulation of coin for the purpose of resumption—

To amass the requisite quantities, by intercepting from the current flowing out of the

country, and by acquiring from the stocks which exist abroad, without disturbing the equilibrium of foreign money markets, is a result to be easily worked out by practical knowledge and judgment.

Now, if this is a result to be easily worked out in this way, why have not his friends proposed a better plan than the republican administration has proposed.

Mr. WILLIS. We will when the responsibility devolves upon us.

Mr. KASSON. Why have you not, when the responsibility is upon you in this House of Representatives, proposed a proper measure? Why has not a single measure for that purpose come from a committee of this House while under the control of the democratic party? Why have they not moved an amendment to this act in the Committee on Banking and Currency, providing for the accumulation of the requisite amounts?

Mr. WILLIS. Because there is a better means than that which is provided by the original act.

Mr. KASSON. And why does not the honorable gentleman for whom they propose to vote suggest those easy and practical ways for arriving at that result? Why is it that the man who sees no obstacle, who wants no obstacle, and whose friends in this House have not the necessary knowledge—why is it that he does not supply the knowledge that will enable them before this session closes to introduce their measure? Certainly this side of the House will vote for it with great promptitude if it tends to the result we so much desire—to relieve the country of its uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, I think the more you examine the position of this question the more you will see that this is not a measure honestly designed for the benefit of the people, but is merely a party bridge across a political chasm. Let this issue be distinctly and constantly drawn, that the party to whose principles I am permanently attached persists in demanding good constitutional money for the laborers, the farmers, the producers of the United States, for all the people of the country, while the so-called party jumps at every form of poor money; first at paper, because it is poorer than gold; and then at silver, because it is more fluctuating, more depreciated than paper.

RESUMPTION OF SPECIE PAYMENTS.

SPEECH of HON. JOHN A. KASSON

OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1876.

The House having under consideration a substitute for the bill (H. R. No. 3074) to repeal in part the resumption act of 1875—

Mr. KASSON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is any one greater cause of discouragement than any other to a gentleman in public life, it is the frequent instances which present themselves of legislative impatience and haste where there is great need of legislative deliberation. No gentleman upon either side of the House, I apprehend, has been here many years without feeling again and again how slight are the rewards offered in our parliamentary system to those gentlemen who desire to devote themselves directly to the solid interests of the people whom they represent. We go on from day to day, from week to week with our legislation without any patient and thorough investigation into the real, substantial interests of the country. But when a so-called political question is presented on this floor parties rally, numbers are aggregated, pressure is brought to bear, debate is cut off, and the party lash applied irrespective of what the great radical interests of the people require.

Sir, the question before the House is one of a class that demands the most serious thought and deliberation and inquiry into the great business interests of the country before we can with any just right say that the repeal of the day of resumption is demanded.

Sir, not one word of proof is presented to you by the Banking and Currency Committee; not one particle of evidence is supplied by the gentlemen who have taken the floor which can be relied upon by a deliberative body, to show that you cannot give this great boon of sound money to the people by the 1st day of January, 1879.

Finding myself met here by political platforms, political candidates, political considerations, I feel how vain it is to address myself with probable good results to that judgment of the representatives of the people which seeks alone the public good.

Gentlemen say no preparation has been made for the resumption of specie payments. Sir, since the financial panic of 1873 enormous preparation has been made. Not by legislative efforts so much as by the voluntary efforts of the people themselves. Economies have come into public, social, and business life throughout the country. Expenses are reduced everywhere. Hundreds of millions of debts have been discharged directly by payments, and other hundreds of millions have been discharged by the processes of the bankrupt courts.

More than that, sir; in the last fiscal year, commencing on the 30th of June, the balance

of trade—without estimating the balance of specie shipments—the balance of trade shows \$77,000,000 of gold value in favor of the United States. And the good work is going on still, reducing imports of luxuries and increasing exports.

And in presence of the fact that this law of 1875 was passed nearly two years after the disaster came upon the country that brought the hard times, (the failure of the Northern Pacific Railroad,) to this law, passed in 1875, the politicians and the demagogues from one end of the country to the other are attributing the hard times of 1873 as the effect of proposed resumption! The hard times came immediately from extravagant railroad enterprises, and ultimately from the extravagance induced by irredeemable and cheap paper money. Mr. Speaker, the question has been abused by the politicians. It is presented here to-day by the politicians. As one gentleman has said, in the ninth month of the session a political platform brings it here—no, not even a political platform, but a political candidate for the Presidency pronounces in his letter, just published, for its repeal, and the bugle-call of party summons you to follow it and repeal a statute whose whole action has been beneficial to permanent American interests.

It is bringing us to the economies demanded and has brought us largely to them. It has brought national, State, and municipal governments to economical practices. It is bringing the balance of trade largely in our favor, amounting, including the specie shipments, to a balance of \$130,000,000 in the last year, as shown by the official letter which I send to the reporters to be published as part of my remarks, verifying what I have said.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

July 8, 1876.

DEAR SIR: I transmit herewith, at your request, a statement showing the imports into and exports from the United States during the eleven months of the fiscal year ended May 31, with an estimate (from some of the ports) for June, and giving the following results:

Imports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1876, \$460,087,277; for the same period in 1875, \$533,005,436, showing a falling off of \$72,918,159.

Exports of Domestic products, (mixed values).....	\$591,677,554
Exports of foreign products....	14,393,342

\$606,070,896

For the fiscal year 1875 \$559,237,638 domestic and \$14,158,611 foreign, showing an increase in the total exports of \$32,674,647.

It will be observed that the domestic exports above given are expressed in mixed

refuge of ignorant malice. Is it true? No man denies that always, at all times and in all parties, some bad men obtain places of honor and emolument, and disgrace by their misconduct and their venality themselves and their friends. It was so in the times of Washington and Jefferson, and every other President the nation ever had. High names might be recalled from the distance that gives oblivion that were polluted by jobbery and bribery.

But fortunately we have official documents that show in rare contrasts the fidelity and honesty of official men since 1834. On the 19th day of June, 1876, the Secretary of the Treasury reported to the Senate of the United States a full and detailed statement of receipts and disbursements from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1875; and also the amount of defalcations in gross and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate received and disbursed, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of February 9, 1876.

I have caused this official statement to be tabulated so as to show the exact state by presidential periods, and I commend it to my Democratic friends as excellent reading for the vacation, and insert it here in my remarks.

Statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Government from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1875; exhibiting also the amount of defalcations and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate received and disbursed, arranged in periods as nearly as practicable of four years each. The disbursements for the Post Office Department are given separately.

Period.	Amount.	Loss on \$1,000.
Jan. 1, 1834, to Dec. 31, 1837.—Andrew Jackson, (Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	\$135,995,960 92	\$10 17
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	110,308,325 19	10 55
P. Office disbursements..	11,697,884 18	1 17
Jan. 1, 1838, to Dec. 31, 1841.—Martin Van Buren, (Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	129,948,548 91	3 01
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	137,094,438 34	21 15
P. Office disbursements..	18,284,961 77	2 83
Jan. 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845.—J. Tyler, (Whig,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	116,736,004 87	3 68
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	109,187,401 24	10 37
P. Office disbursements..	18,666,750 20	14
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849.—James K. Polk, (Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	201,857,508 45	08
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	205,194,700 57	8 34
P. Office disbursements..	16,861,478 41	15
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853.—Taylor and Fillmore, (Whigs,) Pres's:		
Gross receipts.....	211,908,612 91	1 30
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	194,370,493 14	7 64
P. Office disbursements..	26,582,570 74	1 99

Statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Government, etc.—Continued.

Periods.	Amount.	Loss on \$1,000
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857.—Franklin Pierce, (Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	282,179,829 56	75
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	285,638,875 65	5 86
P. Office disbursements..	40,439,110 70	6 92
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861.—Jas. Buchanan, (Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	312,359,679 56	62
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	328,183,268 39	6 98
P. Office disbursements..	56,957,922 74	3 02
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865.—Ab'ham Lincoln, (Rep.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	4,670,460,137 61	10
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	4,667,457,921 22	1 41
P. Office disbursements..	48,779,085 45	1 91
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869.—and'w Johnson, (War Dem.,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	4,042,316,438 46	63
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	3,891,576,259 10	48
P. Office disbursements..	81,016,286 91	2 06
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873.—U. S. Grant, (Republican,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	2,576,645,585 22	37
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	2,601,158,569 90	40
P. Office disbursements..	104,132,079 69	1 13
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875.—U. S. Grant, (Republican,) President:		
Gross receipts.....	1,420,222,898 62	22
Gross disbursements, exclusive of Post Office..	1,406,699,819 31	26
P. Office disbursements..	65,737,724 03	53

GROSS TOTAL RECEIPTS.

Period.	Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.
Jan. 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861..	\$1,390,986,145 18	\$2,907,521 31	\$2 09
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875..	12,709,645,059 91	4,348,098 10	34

GROSS TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS.

Period.	Disbursements.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.
On all acct's. except P. O.			
Jan. 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861..	\$1,369,977,502.52	12,361,722.91	\$9.02
July 1, 1861 to June 30, 1875..	12,566,892,569.53	9,905,205.37	78
Postoffice disbursements:			
Jan. 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861..	189,490,678.74	576,109.78	3.04
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875..	299,665,176.08	413,472.60	1.33

FROM JACKSON'S SECOND TERM TO THE END OF
BUCHANAN'S TERM

Gross total receipts and disbursements from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861—\$2,950,454,326.44 includes loans and Post Office; \$2,250,356,731.04 excludes loans and Post Office.

Gross total losses for the same period, (no loss on loans.) \$15,845,354.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, including loans and Post Office, \$5.36.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, excluding loans and Post Office, \$7.04.

UNDER LINCOLN, JOHNSON AND GRANT.

Gross total receipts and disbursements from July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875—\$25,576,202,805.52 includes loans and Post Office; \$9,701,614,481.43 excludes loans and Post Office.

Gross total losses for the same period, (no loss on loans.) \$14,666,776.07.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, including loans and Post Office, 57 cents!

Gross total loss on \$1,000, excluding loans and Post Office, \$1.51!

It appears then, from the official records of the Treasury Department, prepared in obedience to an order of the Senate, that—

The gross total of receipts and disbursements from the beginning of Jackson's second term to the end of Buchanan's including loans and Post Office, was.....\$2,950,454,326.44

The gross total of receipts and disbursements for the same period, excluding loans and Post Office, was.....\$2,250,356,731 04

Gross losses..... 15,845,354 00

Ratio of losses per \$1,000 on total receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office..... 5 36

Ratio on same, excluding loans and Post Office..... 7 04

Under Lincoln, Johnson and Grant both receipts and disbursements were infinitely larger, and yet the gross amount of losses was smaller and the percentage almost ridiculously disproportioned. Thus—

The gross total of receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office, was.....\$2,576,202,805 32

On the same, including loans and Post Office.....9,701,614,481 43

Gross losses..... 14,666,776 07

Ratio of losses per \$1,000 on total receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office..... 57

Ratio on same, including loans and Post Office..... 1 51

Thus under Democracy in its purity before the war, and under Republican administration including the war, the receipts and disbursements of the first, including loans and Post Office, were about one-ninth of the second; the receipts and disbursements of the first, including loans and Post Office, were about one-fourth of those of the second: while the losses and defalcations of the Democratic period were nearly ten times as great when the loans and Post Office are included, and four-and-a-half times as great when those items are excluded.

But the table bears closer investigation, and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the nearer you come to this actual time in which we live, to this present, existing, much-abused Administration of President Grant, the standard of honor and fidelity, as measured by the official reports, becomes higher and firmer.

The very lowest rate of losses ever reached in this present Presidential term:

On receipts..... .22
On disbursements..... .26
In the Post Office..... .53

and this tabular statement stands in grand contrast with the record of any President of any party who has ever preceded President Grant.

So much for the charge of gross official dishonesty reaching through and corrupting the entire Republican party. The official tables give the lie direct to this wholesale campaign accusation.

Yet in face of these known facts the Democratic party in the House organized themselves into a scandal-making machine, took upon themselves the office of professional slanderers, and charged every one of the regular committees of the House, and many special ones, with this unsavory business.

Public business has been willfully neglected; public necessities ignored, and the whole weight and power of Congress devoted to the manufacture of political capital for the pending election.

Every broken official kicked out for thievery, every cashiered officer, every nameless vagabond was invited, solicited, urged to testify. Partly for revenge, partly for witness fees, partly for cheap notoriety, these birds of evil omen flock to the Capitol, thronged the corridors, took possession of the committee-rooms and of the committees, prompted questions, invented answers, retailed old scandals picked up second-hand, the dead refuse of the streets, to be greedily swallowed by the mouths that stood agape for such carrion food.

The common rights of individual citizens were grossly violated, the sanctity of private correspondence outraged, the telegraphic messages unlawfully forced from their proper keepers, citizens imprisoned by order of the House for no valid reason, and all the rights of private individuals secured by the Constitution trampled down by the decree of the House of Representatives. Secret sessions were held, parties charged with wrong-doing kept in ignorance, and the poor privilege granted to all criminals of an open investigation and of meeting witnesses face to face was denied.

In all this one single and most melancholy case of official misdoing has been undeniably made known, and that has been fairly presented to the proper tribunal by the active co-operation of the Republicans in the House.

You are now trying, Mr. Speaker, by a most singular report from the Committee on Naval Affairs to smirch the reputation of another officer to whom neither the committee nor the House dare give the benefits of cross-examination of witnesses and of an open impeachment and a fair trial before the Senate and the nation.

Sir, the injustice, the gross partiality, the secret inquisitions of the committees of this House are justly a stench and an offense to the American people. Above all things they like fair play, and that is what the Democracy have most carefully refused in the whole course of these examinations.